Email = Kathy Kelly Friend@aol.com - Phone 860-413-3778

## SunPower Corporation - Response to Docket #1257

(Mark Roberts, Objecting to Disallow Duplicate Claims – as filed 1/21/25)

Case #

24-11649-CTG (SunPower Corporation)

Claimant:

Laura Seese (xxx-xx-4764)

\*\*\*\*\* Claim # 11712 \*\*\*\*

Amount:

\$186,000

Today's Date:

February 4, 2025 – Updated #11712

Please consider this my "Written Response to the Objection", as related to the document sent to me 1/21/25 by email, regarding "SunPower Corporation / Mark Roberts "Objection to Cross-Debtor Duplicate Claims" (Schedule 4).

As requested, I am providing this Written Response today (2/3/25, in advance of the 2/4/25 deadline) to: #1) The Office of the Clerk of the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware (824 North Market Street, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Wilmington, Delaware, 19801) and also to #2) Counsel to the Plan Administrator (Richards, Layton, & Finger, One Rodney Square, 920 North King Street, Wilmington, Delaware 19801 (to the Attention of Mark Roberts, Jason Madron, and Zachary Javorsky). This response has been sent BOTH by email and by snail-mail.

## \*\*\* Requested Content \*\*\*

- a) <u>Court/Case Name</u>: US Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware, for "SunPower Corporation et al", Chapter 11, Case #24-11649-CTG Docket #1257, for Claim #11712.
- b) <u>Claimant Name</u>: <u>Laura Seese</u> SS# xxx-xxx-4764. <u>I am an Individual</u>. Claim was originally submitted 10/18/24 for a total of \$186,000. It is comprised of \$3350 (Priority) and \$182,650 (Unsecured). On 1/2/25, I previously responded to indicate that I DISAGREED that my Claim should be "Reclassified", as per Mr. Roberts' proposal. Today, 2/3/25, I am writing to share that I <u>am also in disagreement with his new proposal that this Claim should be eliminated (as a duplicate of Claim #11713). No, they are NOT duplicates: both Claims should remain intact (and BOTH should be allowed) as they were filed by 2 different entities.</u>

## c) <u>Legal/factual basis for my Objection</u>:

1c) <u>SunPower Corporation</u> has violated multiple Federal Statutes. These include the *Uniform Federal Trade Commission Act* (related to Unfair or Deceptive Acts and Practices), the *Dodd-Frank Consumer Protection Act*,

2025 FEB 10 AM 10: 0

หมายสารแพทร์ พรร. - นี้แล้วเหมายสารคาร (การคาร) กระพาทาง (การครับ และกรรมมายสารคามและสารคามและสาริการสา

ව මට වියාත්තියට හැ. මට වර්ගේම අවස්ථ සංවේඛම්ඛයේ වයට 1000 , අතහසුම්කු වෙළට රටස්වූ 2 කණවාර දුපත්වේ කණුම්ක මට එම්ම වේ. දුණව

represent consistent, in entering by bendergray Kuio 2011. However, Space in now missinglish to the the TMENTEEN 16 Maded as palentriated held along open amints needs held, soon whomased - increased residing the CUARMANNS THE RESIDE OF CLOSES TORING SEPARATE (1003 and highlicans) Cleans - and notes at the and the first way agreed the Sandayed. The ways provided the

Strain and a strain of the strain of the

- BENEFIT FOR THE STATE OF STATES OF STATES OF THE STATES OF STATES OF THE STATES OF THE STATES OF THE STATES OF THE

VALAZBAR, and Greena or Classical and some of the selection of supplementary of the Carer glandering of the දක්සිදික් කෙරෙයුණුම් 1... අවධිකාර සේ යුරෝදණාංග ගමුම් යායා 1 කෙර දියුර - වේම වියාද වී කොහැන්මෙන් 61 කියේ අවසු ගණන of the first country of the second for the second to be a first of the first of the second second of the first of the second of organi di mana ikana nga mali mata dapat dapat Company and the second

or the second that has three the color of the color of the second of the color of the second the second of the

## Case 24-11649-CTG Doc 1321 Filed 02/10/25 Page 3 of 4

and the Connecticut Unfair Trade Practices Act. SunPower Employees also violated numerous Federal and State NEC Electrical Codes as well as Federal and State Building Codes.

- 2c) On Page 4 of Docket # 1257-3, it suggests that Epiq hired their own internal staff and that "Professionals performed an in-depth review of the Proofs of Claims". However, they clearly did NOT do a careful review. As they should be aware (since it appears on their own paperwork), each individual Claim should be considered as a separate contested matter, as specified by Bankruptcy Rule 9014. However, Epiq is now attempting to "merge all Claims together" despite the fact that these Claims were each filed individually, on behalf of DIFFERENT CLAIMANTS. That would be illegal. These are SEPARATE (and not duplicate) Claims and none of the submitted Claims should be disallowed. They are NOT duplicates.
- 3c) The language of the Connecticut Unfair Trade Practices Act clearly supports this fact. The law states that "Any Person who suffers a measurable loss of money or property may bring an action to recover that loss". This statement is followed by the confirmation that clarifies, "In this context, the term Person' is defined as 'a natural Person, Corporation, Limited Liability Company, trust, OR other legal entity".

Since each Claim is separate (and filed by a separate entity), NONE of my requested "Schedule 4" Claims should be disallowed. The Claims are against 2 different Claimants, for very different damages (and involve 2 different costs – and requested by 2 different entities). To clarify the different Claims:

- \*\* #<u>11712 Laura Seese</u> (an Individual) against *SunPower Corporation* \$186,000 \*\* #11708 Educational Advancement (an LLC, EIN #33-0993676) against *SunPower Corporation* \$94,000
- #11713 Laura Seese (Individual) against *SunPower Corporation* <u>SYSTEMS</u> for \$186,000 #11709 Educational Advancement (an LLC, EIN #33-0993676) SunPower Corporation <u>SYSTEMS</u> \$94,000
- d) As previously noted, all documentation (covering the time period from 5/2023 to present) has ALREADY been provided to SunPower Corporation and has been in their possession, in SunPower Corporate Files, beginning 6/2023. Please ask the SunPower Elevations Department and the SunPower Tech Support Staff to provide these documents to you for the 2/20/25 Hearing. These records include over 150 emails sent to Sandra Kilpatrick Maquire and 100 emails and telephone calls to SunPower Customer Service and Tech Team. Documentation for the Priority Claim includes SunPower Purchase Contracts (clearly showing a DEPOSIT) along with multiple photos, emails, written transcripts of telephone calls with SunPower Employees, transcripts and photos from 3 SunPower Technician Visits (by SunPower Staff), affidavits from Electricians, Contractors, State, and Town Building Officials, screenshots from the SunPower Website (showing clear violations of the Unfair Trade Practices Acts and Consumer Protections Acts) as well as detailed lists of the SunPower Staff's violations of National & State Electrical NEC Codes, violations of National & State Building Codes, and violations of State Licensing Requirements for installation and maintenance of my SunPower System and a detailed list of the damage caused to my home, my personal property, and to my business equipment and interruptions of business operations from 5/2023 onwards by SunPower Technicians and Employees. Copies of Electrical Schematics and data from the CT State Licensing Board highlighting the violations was previously provided to SunPower.
- e) <u>Authority to reconcile</u>: This Claim is brought by "*Laura Seese*" (SS #xx-4764). Address is 15 Schoolhouse Landing, East Granby, Connecticut 06026. Email = **KathyKellyFriend@aol.com**, Phone 860-413-3778 (no fax)
- f) <u>Please serve Replies</u> to **Laura Seese**, 15 Schoolhouse Landing, East Granby, Connecticut 06026, Phone 860-413-3778 (no Fax number).

Thank you,

Laura Seese

Laura Seese (on 2/3/25)

)

2 SEC - E

What is some to remove